

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 168

FL 021 891

AUTHOR Gaies, Stephen J.; Beebe, Jacqueline D.  
 TITLE The Matched-Guise Technique for Measuring Attitudes  
 and Their Implications for Language Education: A  
 Critical Assessment.  
 PUB DATE 91  
 NOTE 25p.; In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. Language Acquisition  
 and the Second/Foreign Language Classroom. Anthology  
 Series 28; see FL 021 883.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) --  
 Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Attitude Measures; Code Switching (Language);  
 English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; High  
 Schools; High School Students; \*Language Attitudes;  
 \*Language Variation; \*Research Methodology; Second  
 Language Instruction; \*Second Languages; Student  
 Attitudes; Tape Recordings  
 IDENTIFIERS Japan; \*Matched Guise Technique

## ABSTRACT

The matched-guise technique uses recorded voices speaking first in one dialect or language, then in another. Listeners do not know that the speech samples are from the same person, but judge the two guises of the same speaker as two separate speakers. The technique has been used to investigate a variety of sociolinguistic, social-psychological, and educational issues: attitudes of foreign language learners toward target language speakers and community; linguistic bases of teacher prejudice; attitudes toward different language varieties and codes; attitudes toward the speech of nonnatives or language learners; the phenomena of convergence and divergence; and the effect of speaker and hearer variables on comprehension, recall, or evaluation. Two recent applications of the matched-guise technique in Japan investigated: (1) female Japanese high school students' attitudes toward English- or Japanese-speakers introduced as having lived in the United States or not thus introduced; and (2) native Japanese-speakers' reactions to code-switching (Japanese/English). Analysis of the technique's use suggests that some of its supposed advantages may be overstated, and that some alternatives may be as good or better. The overall soundness of the research appears to be more important than the use of this specific technique. Contains 82 references. (MSE)

\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made  
\* from the original document.

THE MATCHED GUISE TECHNIQUE FOR  
MEASURING ATTITUDES AND THEIR  
IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE  
EDUCATION: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Stephen J. Gaius  
Jacqueline D. Beebe

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wong Kim  
Wong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document  
do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy

FLO21891

# THE MATCHED-GUISE TECHNIQUE FOR MEASURING ATTITUDES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE EDUCATION: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Stephen J. Gaius and Jacqueline D. Beebe

Many groundbreaking studies on language attitudes and their relevance in educational settings have made use of subjective reaction tests. One of the most prominent elicitation devices has been the matched-guise technique. Although this technique has great intuitive appeal by virtue of its ability to control, the validity of this measure of subjective reactions to linguistic codes may depend on the nature of the response that subjects make to the guises. The purpose of this paper is to offer a critical assessment of the methodology of the matched-guise technique and to suggest how it might be best employed in future research on the manifestations and consequences, in educational settings, of attitudes toward particular linguistic codes. Some recent efforts to apply the matched-guise technique to investigate different aspects of English language teaching in Japan are described.

## Attitudes and Research on Language Acquisition and Use

There has been almost universal recognition among teachers/researchers that attitudes are a key variable in language development, whether instructed or noninstructed, in a second-language or a foreign-language setting, among children and adults alike. To put it simply, we understand that the attitude that people have toward a language and toward members of a language community have a lot to do with whether and how those people develop proficiency in that language. This understanding is very clearly reflected in some theories of second language development -- the Acculturation Model (Schumann, 1978) and Accommodation Theory (Beebe & Zuengler, 1983) are probably the two best known efforts to assign a central role to attitudinal variables in second language acquisition -- but even the more mentalist theories of second language development often explicitly recognize the importance of attitudes -- for example, in the "affective filter" in Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis.

There has, of course, been considerable debate about what constitute reliable and valid measures of attitudes. However, unlike many other constructs of affect or personality, there is evidence that at least some attitudes related to the perception of group characteristics -- for example, stereotypes of outgroups -- are highly stable and that measures of these attitudes can be highly reliable (see, for example, Oller, 1979).

It also appears that subjective evaluations of social dialects or foreign languages are quite uniform throughout a speech community and that these community "norms" are firmly established as early as school-entering age (Rosenthal, 1974). In addition, we know that in any given speech community, evaluations of speech are systematically related to the presence of particular linguistic variants; the work of Labov (1972a,b) has been particularly influential in this area.

### **What is the Matched-Guise Technique?**

The matched-guise technique is the use of recorded voices of people speaking first in one dialect or language and then in another; that is, in two "guises". ... The recordings are played to listeners who do not know that the two samples of speech are from the same person and who judge the two guises of the same speaker as though they were judging two separate speakers. (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985, p. 171)

The matched-guides technique has two basic purposes:

- (a) to elicit reactions to particular codes by having subjects respond to taped samples of those codes, rather than by having subjects express opinions about the codes themselves, and
- (b) to control all variables other than the codes themselves.

The hope is that subjects will assume that each sample has been produced by a different speaker (and not by the same bilingual or bidialectal individuals). Thus, in a typical application of the matched-guise technique, we might wish to investigate whether members of a bilingual community have different attitudes to the languages of that community by having bilingual speakers produce languages or dialects is the same, we interpret any differences in subjects' reactions to the two

sets of samples to indicate differences in their attitudes toward the linguistic codes and/or the community of speakers of that code.

The matched-guise technique has been applied to a very broad range of sociolinguistic, social psychological, and educational issues:

- a. attitudes of foreign-language learners toward target-language speakers and the target-language community (culture) (e.g., Gardner & Lambert, 1972;)
- b. the linguistic bases of teacher prejudice (e.g., Ford, 1984; Williams, 1970, 1973a,b)
- c. attitudes toward different varieties (e.g., Fremder, Brown, & Lambert, 1970; Fremder & Lambert, 1973), codes (e.g., Bourhis & Giles, 1976; Tucker & El-Dash, 1975)
- d. attitudes toward the speech of language learners or nonnatives (e.g., Fayer & Krasinski, 1987)
- e. the phenomena of convergence and divergence
- f. the effect of speaker and hearer variables (such as gender and/or perceived expertise) on comprehension, recall, or evaluation (e.g., Markham, 1988)

Furthermore, as Chaika (1989) argues, the matched guise technique and other subjective-reaction tests are of value not only for research purposes, but also in job training. Chaika suggests, for example, that "teachers and social workers who need to realize that they may unconsciously evaluate pupils and clients unfavorably just because of their pitch, loudness, tempo, timber, and intonation" (pp. 57-58). Similarly, Milmoe, Rosenthal, Blane, Chafetz, & Wolf (1967) argue that the matched-guise technique can be used to sensitize doctors (and presumably other professionals) to how their own speech will be interpreted and evaluated by their clients.

This paper reports, in very summary form, two recent applications of the learners of English. Each study is, to our knowledge, the first investigation of its kind in the Japanese EFL context, and each explores a phenomenon that has been the subject of much recent discussion. Finally, the studies serve to illustrate some of the challenges, problems, and limitations involved in using the matched-guise

technique in its original form: issues that we will enumerate and briefly discuss below.

### **Two Recent Applications of the Matched-Guise Technique to the Investigation of Japanese Learners of English as a Foreign Language**

Beebe, Harmon, and Kushibuchi (1990) were interested in the reception extended to students who have lived abroad and have then returned to mainstream high schools with possible deficiencies in their Japanese cultural competence but spoken English abilities surpassing those of their classmates and often of their teachers. They looked for evidence to support or cast doubt on the conventional wisdom that returnees may find their status a social liability in both their EFL classes and the rest of their high school life.

Currently, more than 50,000 Japanese of school-age undergo schooling overseas. In his sociolinguistic survey of contact between Japanese and other languages, Loveday (1986) mentions the educational and social difficulties -- including rejection and ridicule by Japanese classmates -- faced by "returning youngsters" (Nihonjin-kikoku-shijo) -- as they (re)enter the Japanese educational system after their period of residence abroad.

White (1988) maintains that the Japanese educational establishment perceives school-age returnees as suffering from an illness from which they must recover; each sign of deviance in dress, eating habits, liberal use of English loan words, etc., is taken more seriously by teachers when it is exhibited by a returnee than when a "normal" Japanese child does the same thing. White also tells of a returnee who was called gaijin, "foreigner" by her classmates.

Sato (1982) reports on the peer pressure returnees face to "'forget' their 'foreign' English and adapt to Japanese-style English" and mentions a returnee who assumes that her teacher will also be pleased with her linguistic readjustment (pp. 67-68). Beebe has seen a returnee with near-native pronunciation of English unconsciously pronounce English words in conformity to the five vowel, open-syllable sound system of Japanese when she demonstrated how she taught English grammar to secondary school students preparing for entrance examinations at a private coaching school. The returnee explained that she had been instructed by the school management to model her lessons after those of the other Japanese teachers of English.

The Beebe, Harmon, and Kushibuchi study assessed attitudes of female students in four Tokyo high schools toward speakers of either English or Japanese who were introduced as Japanese high school students who either had or had not lived in the United States. The research questions were:

1. Will the mean scores of responses to speakers perceived as returnees differ from the mean scores for the same speakers when perceived as non-returnees?
2. Will the mean scores for speakers speaking English differ from the mean scores for the same speakers speaking Japanese?

The speech samples were unscripted one-minute versions of the story "The Tortoise and the Hare" told by bilingual females. The study was administered by the students' American teacher during their English class. A total of 151 questionnaires, written in Japanese, in which subjects responded to one English and to one Japanese guise, were randomly selected for analysis.

The questionnaire asked each subject to rate the extent to which she believed the speaker would share her own views on three controversial issues and to rate the speaker on nine traits anecdotally ascribed to returnees or representing the three personality dimensions distinguished by Lambert (1967) of competence, personal integrity, and social attractiveness.

Results consistently but only very slightly favored returnees over non-returnees. Only one question "I'd like to be friends with this person," prompted a statistically significant difference; a higher score for the Japanese-speaking returnee guise than for the Japanese-speaking non-returnee guise. Furthermore, the judges perceived themselves as holding views almost as similar to those of the returnees as to those of the non-returnees.

While the variable of residential history exerted little effect on scores, English guises showed both a consistent and strong advantage over Japanese guises. On seven out of nine personality traits and on two out of three shared-view scores, English speakers scored significantly higher. While attractiveness as a friend was substantially higher for the English-speaking guises, the strongest effects were for traits representing competence: leadership, worldliness/open-mindedness, intelligence, and language ability. The attitude toward English in Japan appears to

resemble the pattern found in some diglossic speech communities, in which the use of the high, or prestige code, especially enhances perceptions of competence.

It must of course be recognized that the study examined only the reactions of female subjects to female guises. Under any circumstances, the need to confirm whether the response patterns would hold for comparable male subjects reacting to male guises and for cross-sex comparisons is evident. In the particular instance of Japanese school-age returnees, this issue may be especially important, since White (1988) cites evidence that because parents have more conventional future career goals for sons than for daughters they place more importance on strictly reacculturating returnee males in special readjustment schools, while a greater proportion of returnee females are placed back in mainstream Japanese schools.

The second study employing the matched-guise technique to explore language attitudes and their educational implications in Japan explored simultaneously perceptions of code-switching as a linguistic phenomenon and reactions to code-switchers. Furuya-Nakajima and Vogt (1990) were interested in examining the attitudes of monolingual Japanese studying English conversation in school toward code-switching and to individuals who code switch.

Previous research presents very consistent evidence that

- (a) code switching is rule-governed, and not simply the result of random alternations between two codes (see, for example, Pfaff, 1970; Poplack, 1980);
- (b) code switching is not the result of a lack of proficiency in one or both of the codes (see, for example, Appel & Muysken, 1987; Poplack, 1980); but
- (c) both monolinguals (see Grosjean, 1982) and code switchers themselves (see, for example, Amuda, 1986; Chana & Romaine, 1984) often hold negative attitudes toward code switching and toward those who engage in code switching.

The phenomena explored by previous research on code switching has not examined Japanese/English code switching. Since the position of English in Japan is distinctively different from code-switching situations that have been the focus of previous research, mention of a few aspects of the status of English in Japan may be valuable.

Anyone with even a casual interest in contemporary Japan will have observed or heard about the pervasiveness of English in Japanese public settings: in the media, on T-shirts, in almost any use of language intended for public consumption. According to Haarman (1984), the pervasive use of English in the mass media simply reflects stereotyped conceptions and social values in Japan to foreign languages. On the basis of his survey, Haarman concludes that the impact of English on Japan has created what he calls an "impersonal bilingualism" which is unrelated to any features of monolingual interaction in everyday community life in Japan.

Beneath this veneer of English, however, is a potentially more important phenomenon: the massive amount of English lexicon that has been absorbed into Japanese. Stanlaw (1982), for example, estimates that 8 percent of the contemporary Japanese lexicon is English-based. This figure, however accurate (see, for example, the reservations voiced by Loveday, 1986), reflects the strong amount of contact between English and Japanese. There is evidence, moreover, that at least some elements of this bilingualism, "impersonal" or not, do not elicit a uniform reaction among native speakers of Japanese. Ishino (1983), for example, found that for certain borrowings, different age groups differed by as much as 60 percent in their judgment of the acceptability of the borrowings as Japanese: Whereas the loan for live (which is invariably written in katakana, the script for loanwords, and which refers to a pop or rock concert) was considered as "Japanese" by only 16 out of 100 informants in their 50's and in positions of authority, 79 out of 104 university students judged the loan to be acceptable.

Furuya-Nakajima and Vogt thus hypothesized that the linguistic competence of code-switchers would be evaluated negatively by monolingual speakers of Japanese. They further hypothesized that their subjects would attribute more unflattering personality characteristics --- those of someone "non-Japanese" or "contaminated" -- to the code-switching speakers than to the same speakers using Japanese only.

Two Japanese females in their early 30's, balanced bilinguals who had lived abroad and attended international schools, each gave the directions to her house, once in Japanese only, and once using English/Japanese code-switching.

The subjects who judged the guises were 22 females and 6 males ranging in age from eighteen to twenty-one. They were attending two intermediate-level college English classes, and the study was carried out in Japanese by a Japanese researcher.

From their responses to the open-ended questions that served to elucidate and to validate the ratings on the semantic differential scales, it was clear that these subjects did not view code switching with much admiration and perceived it as an inappropriate response to English speakers who understand some Japanese but not enough to take in a message entirely in Japanese.

Thus, like monolinguals elsewhere, these Japanese subjects exhibit evidence of negative attitudes toward code switching, attitudes that lead them to respond differentially to monolinguals and to code-switchers. Speakers were perceived as "standing out" or "flashy" in their Japanese/English guise; they were also rated as more sociable, more entertaining, more creative, more flexible, more ambitious, and more self-confident; in their Japanese guise, on the other hand, they were judged to be more intelligent, more dependable, more sincere, and more well-mannered.

### **Methodological Issues in the Use of the Matched-Guise Technique**

It must be remembered that the matched-guise technique is simply that: a technique for eliciting attitudes toward language codes and their users. Any research employing the matched-guise technique must of course strive to eliminate, or at least to minimise, threats to internal and external validity. (Campbell & Stanley, 1963, provide the list that is most often drawn upon in discussion of experimental validity.) Such research must also demonstrate that the instruments used provide a reliable measure of the behavior being investigated.

Thus, we wish to limit our discussion to those methodological issues that apply particularly or uniquely to the use of the matched-guise technique to investigate attitudes toward and about second/foreign language education and the settings in which such instruction takes place. We will discuss six such issues (recognizing, of course, that others might, in a more comprehensive review, also be worthy of discussion).

#### **1. The use of matched guises: Is it necessary? Is it sufficient?**

The first, and in some ways the crucial issue, concerns the very nature of the matched-guise technique: namely, the question of what precisely is and needs to be "matched." One aspect of this issue that has received considerable attention is the relative advantages having speakers read from scripts (including control of linguistic variables) and of having speakers produce semi- or unscripted speech. An

equally important issue, however, concerns the necessity of controlling variables of voice quality, which is the primary justification for the matched-guise technique. Hudson (1980), for example, has argued that in some cases the use of guises may be counterproductive, since there is a danger that a speaker "may be producing an exaggerated version of the accents or dialects he is simulating" (p. 205). Hudson goes on to argue that since "there is little difference between results produced by the matched guise technique and those where the voices were each produced by a different speaker" (p. 205), the use of the matched-guise technique may be unnecessary.

To argue that the use of bilinguals is unnecessary and that "comparable" monolinguals might be used to prepare speech samples raises other questions:

- (a) Is the use of bilinguals sufficient to produce "matched" samples of speech, and
- (b) How do we establish comparability (regardless of whether bilinguals or monolinguals are used).

We might begin with the very phenomenon that Hudson cites: the comparability of voice quality. We know that meanings and values are assigned to voice qualities: Streeter et al. (1977), for example, found that deceptive speech tended to have a higher pitch than truthful speech and that higher-pitched speech was judged to be less truthful by listeners. We also know that voice qualities are not valued similarly across speech and language communities: Chaika (1989), for example, discusses the "meanings" communicated by changes in pitch by American English-speaking Blacks.

Thus, one might imagine that the characteristic high pitch that Japanese females appear to cultivate would almost certainly elicit less favorable reactions from American English-speaking subjects than from Japanese-speaking subjects. However, would Japanese subjects respond differently to high- and low-pitched English spoken by females? For this reason, the degree of control involved in the use of the matched-guises are delivered in such a way as to produce voice qualities that are equally valued by (or at least equally typical of) their respective language communities, can we be sure that two guises of the same speaker are any more comparable than the voices of two different speakers?

2. The use of a limited number of speakers: Is there as much variation within groups as between groups?

Many studies employing the matched-guise technique have used one or a very limited number of speakers. This raises the question of how consistently subjects react to different speakers of the same language or, to put it another way, whether reactions to different speakers of the same code vary just as much as do reactions to speakers of different codes. In both of the studies that we have summarized in this paper, there is evidence that characteristics of individual speakers may have had considerable influence on the reactions of the subjects. In the code-switching study, the two speakers interpreted the researchers' directions to speak as if to a friend differently and one speaker employed a more formal register of Japanese than the other. In the returnee study, one of the two speakers provoked the strongest negative reactions in her Japanese guise and the strongest positive reactions in her English guise. This, the researchers speculated, might well have been due to, among other things, reactions to what they perceived to be the highly distinctive "personality cue value" (Webster & Kramer, 1968, p. 239) of the voice of the speaker who elicited the extreme reactions in both languages.

3. How credible (authentic) is the context in which a matched-guise investigation is carried out?

Research on language attitudes has shown that individuals rarely hesitate to form judgments about a speaker's character and personality on the basis of a very limited sample of speech. Nevertheless, the importance of presenting subjects with credible tasks -- that is, tasks that are suited to the subjects' backgrounds and abilities and to the setting in which the research is being carried out -- is worth emphasizing. In the Beebe et al. study, subjects were told that they were to respond to samples of speech produced by high school-age speakers who were being considered for use in recording taped material to accompany a new textbook series. This, we would contend, was a credible task to have learners perform in an English classroom; subjects' reactions would seem to be highly relevant to the selection of speakers to record pedagogical materials.

Often, however, subjects are asked to react to speakers for no particular reason, without specific guidelines, or, worst of all, in a way that forces subjects to pretend that they are someone other than themselves (for examples of this latter problem, see Carranza & Ryan, 1975; Swacker, 1977).

For example, in the Furuya-Nakajima and Vogt study on code switching, the subjects were not told the nationality of the speakers or to whom the directions to the home were being given. The answers to the open-ended questions indicate that the subjects made assumptions of their own and established their own criteria; most assumed that the speaker was a Japanese returnee, and some commented that if the addressee were a foreigner, English should be used, while Japanese ought to be the choice when speaking to a fellow Japanese. (This demonstrates the value of either a written or verbal debriefing of subjects in interpreting the results of judgments.)

The subjects in the Furuya-Nakajima and Vogt study on code switching were in most cases proficient enough in English to understand all of the English used by the code-switching guises; the fact that they offered numerous and strong reactions to the English proficiency of the speakers is interesting, of course, but their judgments may be suspect since they were being asked to compare two unequal alternatives: If a Japanese-English bilingual were speaking to a monolingual Japanese (even one who had studied English in school for as many years as these subjects had), Japanese, rather than Japanese-English code switching, would be the only reasonable alternative. In effect, the subjects were being asked to imagine that they were someone else: a Japanese-English bilingual, or a nonnative speaker of Japanese, for whom a Japanese-only set of directions might have been less understandable or pleasing than directions given in English and Japanese.

#### 4. The need for debriefing: Were subjects properly deceived?

The value of using the matched-guise technique rather than more direct measures (e.g., questionnaires) is that it "appears to reveal judges' more private reactions to the contrasting group" (Lambert, Anisfeld, & Yeni-Komshian, 1965). This is true, however, only if the deception is successful: that is, if subjects actually believed that they were reacting to what they thought were different speakers. This points to the need for either pilot testing (see, for example, Wolck, 1973) or, preferably, debriefing.

The advantage of debriefing is that in any of a number of ways--through open-ended questionnaires, through interviews, or through other means -- subjects can indicate not only whether they were in fact deceived, but also any other reactions that might shed light on the meaning of their response to semantic differential scales (or whatever primary task is involved).

In the Beebe et al. study, some doubt was cast on the believability of the guises in comments by independent listeners who, when questioned about the age of the speakers, judged them to be older than high school age. The study would have been directly questioned about their speculations on the purpose of the study and the identities of the speakers.

Sometimes, the design of a study does not permit debriefing; an example of this is Bourhis and Giles's (1976) investigation of reactions of theatergoers to different versions of a public-address announcement. However, in research on attitudes of language learners, debriefing is normally quite feasible, and it is therefore surprising that it has not been done more regularly.

##### 5. The validity of semantic differential scales.

Semantic differential scales are not the only way to elicit reactions of subjects to samples of speech. There are many other ways to have subjects make judgments about guises, and these, as well as performance tasks have been used in matched-guise research (see Appendix).

However, semantic differential scales have been used so frequently in matched-guise research that they require some comment. As Oller (1979, p. 36) has pointed out, the tendency of [semantic differential] scales to correlate in meaningful ways is about the only evidence we have concerning the validity of such scales. Thus, the fact that negatively valued scales such as "stubborn", "nervous", and "shy" tend to cluster together (by correlation and factor analysis techniques) is the primary basis on which the validity of semantic differential scales is argued.

The problem, however, is that what is positively or negatively valued by a group cannot always be known in advance (see Yamamoto & Swan, 1989, for an empirical investigation of this issue). This is a problem that has been acknowledged since the matched-guise technique was first used (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) and which the returnee study again illustrates. Beebe, Harmon, and Kushibuchi (1990) originally assumed that the Japanese word *sukeban*, which they translated into English as "rebelliousness" and which in Japanese refers to "bad" teenaged-girls who are apt to be gang leaders, would be a negatively valued trait. But this trait scored much higher for the guise that received positive ratings on most other traits and much lower for the guise that received the lowest ratings overall. This the researchers interpreted to mean that "a dash of rebelliousness was seen [by their subjects] as a positive trait."

In their discussion of their code-switching study, Furuya-Nakajima and Vogt maintain that "ambition" and "self-confidence" are more highly valued in the West than in Japan, and thus the high ratings the code-switching guises received on these two traits could be seen as reflecting a negative evaluation.

The second issue involves differences in meaning between labels, in different languages, for the ends of semantic differential scales. Since it is often difficult to find exact or even close equivalents (compare, for example, the English word friendly with the Spanish word simpatico), there will inevitably be some imprecision in comparing responses made by monolingual speakers of different languages to different guises.

6. To what extent do reactions to speech samples in a matched-guise study correlate with (and perhaps predict) actual overt behavior?

The unresolved questions surrounding semantic differential scales are part of a larger issue: namely, degree to which reactions to speech samples in matched-guise research correlates with (and predicts) actual behavior.

This problem is pervasive in research on attitudes, and only rarely have efforts been made to attempt to investigate the relationship between subjective reactions and actual behavior: for example, Fishman's (1968) use of what he questionnaire about attitudes of Puerto Ricans toward their own ethnicity and attendance at a Puerto Rican cultural evening (to which all subjects had been invited).

In the absence of meaningful correlations between the results of matched-guise research and actual behavior, it becomes difficult to know what one has in fact measured. For example, the surprisingly positive attitudes toward returnees that subjects revealed indirectly in the Beebe et al. study suggest that English ability is a social advantage, but virtually everything that has been reported anecdotally and in a growing body of research into the issue of school-age returnees to Japan suggests that the English ability of returnees is viewed with suspicion.

The Beebe et al. study did not investigate how these subjects would react if they were directly addressed by a peer in fluent English. Would they converge upward toward the fluent speaker of English, or would they become so flustered that the returnee would have to accommodate downward to their ability level?

What we must remember is that the matched-guise technique was designed to elicit stereotypical attitudes toward groups. It may well be such attitudes determine, at least partially, how individuals actually respond to or interact with individual members of their own or some other group, but what is not known, for example, with regard to returnees, is whether the attitudes toward returnees that are tapped by the matched-guise technique correlate with behavior of Japanese students toward returnee classmates.

### Conclusion

Insofar as the matched-guise technique itself is concerned, the research that we have reported here suggests what also seems to be true of much previous research: namely, that some of the advantages of the technique as it was originally designed may be more apparent than real; furthermore, there appear some distinct advantages to and no compelling arguments against the use of an alternative approach to the preparation of speech samples: Rather than having the same speaker(s) perform in two or more different guises, several speakers (not necessarily bilinguals) of one code are "matched" subjectively with several speakers of another code, in an effort to produce equivalent sets of samples (see, for example, Alford & Strother (1990).

In conclusion, we research employing the matched-guise technique depend only partially on the technique itself and as much or more on the overall methodological soundness of the research. Methodological considerations aside, however, we would agree with Edwards (1982) that the matched-guise technique provides useful information which can and needs to be confirmed by other means.

### THE AUTHORS

Stephen J. Gaies is a professor of English at the University of Northern Iowa. During the 1990-1991 academic year, he is a visiting professor at Temple University Japan. He is the author of Peer Involvement in Language Learning (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985) and the former editor of the TESOL Quarterly.

Jacqueline D. Beebe is a lecturer in English at the College of Commerce of Nihon University.

## REFERENCES

AGHEYISI, R., & Fishman, J. 1970. *Language Attitude Studies: A Brief Survey on Methodological Approaches*. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12(5), 137-157.

ALFORD, R.L., & Strother, J.M. 1990. *Attitudes of Native and Non-native Speakers Toward Selected Regional Accents of U.S. English*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 479-495.

d'ANGLEJAN, A., & Tucker, G.R. 1973. *Sociolinguistic Correlates of Speech Style in Quebec*. In Fasold, R.W. (ed.), *Variation in the Form and Use of Language: A Sociolinguistics Reader* (pp. 327-353). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

ANISFIELD, M., & Lambert, W.E. 1961. *Social and Psychological Variables in Learning Hebrew*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 524-529.

ANISFIELD, M., Bogo, N., & Lambert, W.E. 1962. *Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 65, 223-231.

APPEL, R., & Muyken, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

BEEBE, J.D., Harmon, J., & Kushibuchi, T. 1990. *Attitudes of Japanese High School Students Towards Returnees*. Unpublished Manuscript.

BEEBE, J.D., & Zuengler, J. 1983. *Accommodation Theory: An Explanation for Style Shifting in Second Language Dialects*. In Wolfson, N., and Judd, E. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 195-213). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

BLOM J.-P., & Gumperz, J.J. 1972. *Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: Code-switching in Norway*. In J.J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 404-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

BOGARDUS, E.S. 1925. *Measuring Social Distance*. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 9, 299-308.

BOUCHARD-RYAN, E. 1973. *Subjective Reaction Toward Accented Speech*. In Shuy, R. W., and Fashold, R.W. (eds.), *Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects* (pp. 60-73). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

BOURHIS, R., & Giles, H. 1976. *The Language of Cooperation in Wales: A Field Study*. *Languages Sciences*, 42, 13-16.

BOURHIS, R., Giles, H., & Lambert, W. 1975. *Social Consequences of Accommodating One's Style of Speech: A Cross-national Investigation*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 6, 55-71.

CAIRNS, E., & Duriez, B. 1975. *The Influence of Speakers' Accent on Recall by Catholic and Protestant School Children in Northern Ireland*. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 15, 441-442.

CAMPBELL, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research on Teaching*. In N.L. Gage (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 171-246). Chicago: Rand McNally.

CARRANZA, M., & Ryan, E.B. 1975. *Evaluative Reactions of Bilingual Anglo and Mexican American Adolescents Towards Speakers of English and Spanish*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 6, 83-104.

CHAIKA, E. 1980. *Language: The Social Mirror* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House.

CHANA, U., & Romaine, S. 1984. *Evaluative Reactions to Panjabi/English Code-switching*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 5, 447-473.

CHIHARA, R., & Oller, J.W., Jr. 1978. *Attitudes and Attained Proficiency in EFL: A Sociolinguistic Study of Adult Japanese Speakers*. *Language Learning*, 28, 55-68.

COOPER, R.L. & Fishman, J.A. 1974. *The Study of Language Attitudes*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 3, 5-19.

COOPER, R.L., Fishman, J.A., Town, L., Scheier, B., & Seckback, F. 1977. *Language, Technology, and Persuasion in the Middle East: Three Experimental Studies*. In Giles, H. (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations* (pp. 83-98). London: Academic Press.

DOWNS, L., & Olson, T. 1980. *What Happens to Japanese Who Graduate from ASIJ?* ASIJ Shimbun.

EL-DASH, L., & Tucker, G.R. 1975. *Subjective Reactions to Various Speech Styles in Egypt*. *International Journal of Language*, 6, 33-54.

FASOLD, R. (Ed.). 1973. *Variation in the Form and Use of Language: A Sociolinguistics Reader*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

FASOLD, R. 1981. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

FAYER, J.M., & Krasinski, E. 1987. *Native and Non-native Judgments of Intelligibility and Irritation*. *Language Learning*, 37, 313-326.

FISHMAN, J.A. 1968. *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

FORD, C.E. 1984. *The Influence of Speech Variety on Teachers' Evaluation of Students with Comparable Academic Ability*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 25-40.

FREMDER, R., & Lambert, W.E. 1973. *Speech Style and Scholastic success: The Tentative Relationships and Possible Implications for Lower Class Children*. In Shuy, R. (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects* (pp. 237-271). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press

FREMDER, R., Brown, B., & Lambert, W.E. 1970. *The Role of Speech Characteristics in Scholastic Success*. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 299-306.

FURUYA-NAKAJIMA, N., & Vogt, L.D. 1990. "Nanka I Think Speaking 'Charpon' is Ichiban Natural": A matched-guise Experiment. Unpublished Manuscript.

GAERTNER, S.I., & Bickman, L. 1971. *Effects of Race on the Elicitation of Helping Behaviour: The Wrong Number Technique*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 20, 218-222

GARDNER, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language-Learning*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House

GENESEE, F., & Bourhis, R.Y. 1988. *Evaluative Reactions to Language Choice Strategies: The Role of Sociocultural Factors*. *Language and Communication*, 8, 220-250

GILES, H., Baker, S., & Fielding, G. 1975. *Communication Length as a Behavioural Index of Accent Prejudice*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 6, 73-81.

GILES, H., & Powesland, P. 1975. *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*. London: Academic Press.

GILES, H., & Robinson, W.P. (Eds.) 1990. *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

HAARMAN, H. 1984. *The Role of Ethnocultural Stereotypes and Foreign Languages in Japanese Commercials*. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 50, 101-121.

HOFFER, B. 1990. *English Loanwords in Japanese: Some Cultural Implications*. *Language Sciences*, 12(1), 1-21.

HOOVER, M.R. 1978. *Community Attitudes Toward Black English*. *Language in Society*, 7, 65-87.

HOPPER, R. 1977. *Language Attitudes in the Job Interview*. *Communication Monographs*, 44, 346-351.

HUDSON, R.A. 1980. *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ISHINO, H. 1983. *Gendai-gairaigo-ko [Thoughts on Contemporary Foreign Borrowings]*. Tokyo: Taishukan.

KIMBLE, J., Jr. 1968. *Language Shift and the Interpretation of Conversations*. *Lingua*, 23, 127-134.

KRASHEN, S. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.

LABOV, W. 1972a. *On the Mechanism of Linguistic Change*. In Gumperz, J., & Hymes, D. (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 512-538). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

LABOV, W. 1972b. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

LAMBERT, W.E. 1967. *A Social Psychology of Bilingualism*. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 21-109.

LAMBERT, W.E., Anisfeld, M., & Yeni-Komshian, G. 1965. *Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variations*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 84-90.

LAMBERT, W.E., Hodgson, R.C., Gardner, R.C., & Fillenbaum, S. 1960. *Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60(1), 41-61.

LAMBERT, W.E., Frankel, H., & Tucker, G.R. 1966. *Judging Personality through Speech: A French-Canadian Example*. *The Journal of Communication*, 16, 305-321.

LOVETT, I. 1986. *Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MARKHAM, P.L. 1988. *Gender and the Perceived Expertness of the Speaker as Factors in ESL Listening Recall*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, 397-406.

MEYER, C. 1988. *A Voice from Japan: An Outsider Looks In*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

MILMOE, S., Rosenthal, R., Blane, H.T., Chafetz, M.E., & Wolf, I. 1967. *The Doctor's Voice: Postdictor of Successful Referral of Alcoholic Patients*. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 72, 78-84.

OKAMURA-BICHARD, F. 1985. *Mother Tongue Maintenance and Second Language Learning: A Case of Japanese Children*. *Language Learning*, 35, 63-89.

OLIER, J.W., Jr. 1979. *Language Tests at School: A Pragmatic Approach*. London: Longman.

PASSIN, H. 1980. *Japanese and the Japanese*. Tokyo: Kinseido.

PENALOSA, F. 1981. *Introduction to the Sociology of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: Newbury House.

PFAFF, C. 1979. *Constraints on Language Mixing: Intrasentential Code-switching and Borrowing in Spanish/English*. *Language*, 55, 291-318.

POPLACK, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y Termino En Espanol": Toward a Typology of Code switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.

PRESTON, M.S. 1963. *Evaluation Reactions to English Canadian French and European French Voices*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, McGill University.

RAMIREZ, A.G., & Milk, R.G. 1986. *Notions of Grammaticality Among Teachers of Bilingual Pupils*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 495-513.

RICHARDS, J.C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. 1985. *Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

ROSENTHAL, M. 1974, Spring/Fall. *The Magic Boxes: Pre school Children's Attitudes Towards Black Standard English*. *Florida FL Reporter*, 55-93.

RYAN, E.B., & Giles, H. (Eds.). 1982. *Attitudes Towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts*. London: Edward Arnold.

SATO, Y. 1982. *Facing Silent Society: The Maladjustment of Japanese Returning Children*. Harvard Graduate School of Education, pp. 29..

SCHUMANN, J. 1978. *The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

SFLIGMAN, C.R., Tucker, G.R., & Lambert, W.E. 1972. *The Effects of Speech Style and Other Attributes on Teachers' Attitudes Toward Pupils*. *Language in Society*, 1, 131-142.

SHAW, M.E., & Wright, J.M. 1967. *Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes*. New York: McGraw Hill.

SPOISKY, B. 1969. *Attitudinal Aspects of Second Language Learning*. *Language Learning*, 19, 271-283.

STANLAW, J. 1982. *English in Japanese Communicative Strategies*. In Kachru, B.B. (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*, (pp. 168-197). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

STREETER, I.A., Krauss, R.M., Geller, V., Okon, C., & Apple, W. 1977. *Pitch Changes during Attempted Deception*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 345-350.

SWACKER, M.E. 1977. *Attitudes of Native and Non-native Speakers Toward Varieties of American English*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University.

TRUDGILL, P., & Tzavaras, G. 1977. *Why Albanian-Greeks are not Albanians: Language Shift in Attica and Biotia*. In Giles, H. (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations*, (pp. 171-184). London: Academic Press.

WEBSTER, W.G., & Kramer, E. 1968. *Attitudes and Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech*. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 75, 231-240.

WHITE, M. 1989. *The Japanese Overseas: Can they go home again?*. New York: The Free Press.

WILLIAMS, F. 1970. *Psychological Correlates of Speech Characteristics: On Sounding "disadvantaged"*. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 13, 472-488.

WILLIAMS, F. 1973a. *Some Recent Studies of Language Attitudes*. In Shuy, R.W. (ed.), *Some New Directions in Linguistics*, (pp. 121-140). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

WILLIAMS, F. 1973b. *Some Research Notes on Dialect Attitudes and Stereotypes*. In Fasold, R.W. (ed.), *Variation in the Form and Use of Language: A Sociolinguistics Reader*, (pp. 354-360). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

WOLCK, W. 1973. *Attitudes Toward Spanish and Quechua in Bilingual Peru*. In Fasold, R.W. (ed.), *Variation in the Form and Use of Language: A Sociolinguistics Reader*, (pp. 370-388). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

YAMAMOTO, M., & SWAN, J. 1989. *Connotative Differences between Foreign and Japanese English Teachers in Japan*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10, 233-253.

## Appendix

### Responding to Speech Samples

#### judgment tasks

- judgments about occupational status
- guessing a speaker's occupation
- judging suitability for a specific job/occupation
- judging employability

#### judgments about intellectual/academic potential

- rating quality of school work
- predicting future academic success

#### forming and changing opinions

#### performance measures

#### recall tasks (e.g., Cairns & Duriez, 1976; Markham, 1988)

### **judgments about occupational status**

guessing a speaker's occupation (Labov, 1972a)  
[Sociolinguistic Patterns]  
judgments about suitability for a job/occupation  
judgments about employability

### **judgments about intellectual/academic potential**

rating quality of school work  
predictions about future academic success

### **helping behavior (Gaertner & Bickman, 1971)**

Gaertner and Bickman (1971) had both Black and White callers telephone 540 Black and White subjects, pretending to get the wrong number. Callers told each subject that they were stranded and had used their last dime. Then they requested that the subject call another number to send help. At this number there was a confederate of the caller who recorded which subjects had responded to the caller's request for aid. Black subjects helped Black and White callers equally. Whites helped Blacks less frequently than they helped Whites. This, of course, might also be explained on the basis of racial prejudice; however, it does show that the dialect used does, in and of itself, affect how others treat you. (Chaika, 1989, p. 202)

### **communication length (e.g., writing letters of recommendation (Giles, Baker, & Fielding, 1975;)**

Giles, Baker, and Fielding (1975) developed an experiment to test the reactions of subjects to RP and the nonstandard variety of Birmingham, England. In this application of the matched-guise technique, a male speaker who was proficient in both varieties addressed two groups of Birmingham high school students. The students had to write letters of recommendation stating their opinion of this speaker as a suitable candidate to lecture high school students about the nature of university

studies. The students also had to evaluate him on traditional rating scales. The study was motivated by findings from previous research that subjects write longer letters about someone they like than about someone they don't like. Also, it had previously been demonstrated that subjects speak more when they are conversing with someone they like.

Giles et al. reasoned that if more students wrote letters for the speaker and wrote longer opinions when he was speaking in one guise than in the other, that would demonstrate that the dialect alone caused him to be rated differently. The high school students to whom the speaker had used RP wrote 82 percent more about him than those who heard him talk in his Birmingham accent. Out of 18 subjects, 13 found him "well-spoken" in his RP guise, but only 2 out of 28 subjects who heard him in his Birmingham guise judged him as "well-spoken."

**making a decision/choice (e.g., Rosenthal, 1974)**

**forming and changing opinions (e. g., Giles & Powesland, 1975 [capital punishment]; Cooper, Fishman, Lown, Scheier, & Seckbach, 1977; Cooper & Fishman, 19XX [tobacco and alcohol].**